UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/806,783	05/21/2001	David Gymer	GDC-136	6489

24283 7590 12/21/2004

PATTON BOGGS
1660 LINCOLN ST
SUITE 2050
DENVER, CO 80264

EXAMINER	
ISMAIL, SHAWKI SAIF	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2155	

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/806,783	GYMER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shawki S Ismail	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE f this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 May 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *19-22* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-26 are presented for examination.

Applicant's claim for priority is acknowledged.

Claim Objections

2. A series of singular dependent claims is permissible in which a dependent claim refers to a preceding claim which, in turn, refers to another preceding claim.

A claim which depends from a dependent claim should not be separated by any claim which does not also depend from said dependent claim. It should be kept in mind that a dependent claim may refer to any preceding independent claim. In general, applicant's sequence will not be changed. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Cook et al.,** (Cook) U.S Patent No. **5,802,309.**

5. As to claim 1, Cook teaches a method of supplying data from a table in a device which is responsive to network management protocol commands, the method comprising receiving a Protocol Data Unit designated as a table block access request (col. 3, lines 9-15);

identifying the Protocol Data Unit as a table block access request (col. 3, lines 9-15);

obtaining an Object Identifier of a table to be read from the Protocol Data Unit (col. 3, lines 9-15 and col. 2, lines 23-28);

obtaining an index to a row to be read from the table from the Protocol Data Unit (col. 5, lines 52-59);

looking up information in the table based on the Object Identifier and the index to the row to be read 9col. 6, lines 37-49);

composing a response Protocol Data Unit containing information read from the table for a plurality of rows based on the number of rows to be read (col. 6, lines 53-56);

outputting the response packet (col. 6, lines 53-56).

Cook teaches the method of collecting complete rows in a table (col. 3, lines 9-15). Cook does not explicitly teach wherein a determination is made as to the number of rows to be read. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention that in order to collect the complete rows in the table a determination is made as to the number of rows that have to be collected in order to maintain system efficiency. The system will have

to know the number of rows needed to be collected prior to the collection of rows in the table to ensure that each row was collected.

6. As to claim 2, Cook teaches the method according to Claim 1, wherein Object Identifiers are only included in the response packet if requested (col. 6, lines 37-52).

7. As to claim 3, Cook teaches the method according to Claim 1, wherein if Object Identifiers for the rows are to be included in the response packet, a single Object Identifier is included for each row (col. 6, lines 37-49).

8. As to claim 4, Cook teaches the method according to Claim 2, wherein if Object Identifiers for the rows are to be included in the response packet, a single Object Identifier is included for each row (col. 2, lines 23-28)

9. As to claim 5, Cook teaches the method according to Claim 2 wherein abbreviated Object Identifiers are included in the response packet (col. 6, lines 37-49).

10. As to claim 6, Cook teaches the method according to Claim 3 wherein abbreviated Object Identifiers are included in the response packet (col. 6, lines 37-49).

11. As to claim 7, Cook teaches the method according to claim 1 wherein information representative of the number of rows actually included in the response packet is included in the response packet, least when the number of rows supplied differs from the number of rows requested (col. 6, lines 37-57).

12. As to claim 8, Cook teaches the method according to claim 4 wherein information representative of the number of rows actually included in the

response packet is included in the response packet, at least when the number of rows supplied differs from the number of rows requested (col. 6, lines 37-57).

13. As to claim 9, Cook teaches the method according to claim 6 wherein information representative of the number of rows actually included in the response packet is included in the response packet, at least when the number of rows supplied differs from the number of rows requested (col. 6, lines 37-57).

14. As to claim 10, Cook teaches the method according to claim 1 including selecting one or more columns from which data is to be included based on column identifier information within the received Protocol Data Unit (col. 5, lines 52-59).

15. As to claim 11, Cook teaches the method according to claim 4 including selecting one or more columns from which data is to be included based on column identifier information within the received Protocol Data Unit (col. 5, lines 52-59).

16. As to claim 12, Cook teaches the method according to claim 6 including selecting one or more columns from which data is to be included based on column identifier information within the received Protocol Data Unit (col. 5, lines 52-59).

17. As to claim 13, Cook teaches the method according to claim 7 including selecting one or more columns from which data is to be included based on column identifier information within the received Protocol Data Unit (col. 5, lines 52-59).

18. As to claim 14, Cook teaches the method according to Claim 6, wherein the column identifier information is in the form of index information (col. 5, lines 52-59).

19. As to claim 15, it contains similar limitations as in claim 1; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

20. As to claim 16, Cook teaches the method according to Claim 15 further comprising determining whether the received Protocol Data Unit contains all the data requested and, if not, composing a further request for data (col. 3, lines 9-15).

21. As to claim 17, Cook teaches the method according to Claim 15 further comprising supplying the data to a management application (col. 2, lines 63-67).

22. As to claim 18, Cook teaches the method according to Claim 16 further comprising supplying the data to a management application (col. 2, lines 63-67).

23. As to claim 19, Cook teaches the method according to claim 1,wherein the network management protocol is Simple Network Management Protocol, or a derivative or modification thereof (col. 2, lines 23-28).

24. As to claim 20, Cook teaches the method according to claim 4, wherein the network management protocol is Simple Network Management Protocol, or a derivative or modification thereof (col. 2, lines 23-28).

25. As to claim 21, Cook teaches the method according to claim 6, wherein the network management protocol is Simple Network Management Protocol, or a derivative modification thereof (col. 2, lines 23-28).

26. As to claim 22, Cook teaches the method according to claim 12, wherein the network management protocol is Simple Network Management Protocol, derivative or modification thereof (col. 2, lines 23-28).

27. As to claim 23, it contains similar limitations as in claim 1; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

28. As to claim 24, Cook teaches the device according to Claim 23, wherein the network management protocol is Simple Network Management Protocol, derivative or modification thereof (col. 2, lines 23-28).

29. As to claim 25, it contains similar limitations as in claim 1; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

30. As to claim 26, it contains similar limitations as in claim 1 and 10; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

The Prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Chen et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,076,107

b. Champlin et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,519,635

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shawki S Ismail whose telephone number is 571-272-3985. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.
If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shawki Ismail
Patent Examiner
December 13, 2004

HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER